

RAMSEY & EHRLICH LLP  
MILES EHRLICH - #237954  
[miles@ramsey-ehrlich.com](mailto:miles@ramsey-ehrlich.com)  
ISMAIL RAMSEY - #189820  
[izzy@ramsey-ehrlich.com](mailto:izzy@ramsey-ehrlich.com)  
AMY CRAIG - #269339  
[amy@ramsey-ehrlich.com](mailto:amy@ramsey-ehrlich.com)  
803 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
(510) 548-3600 (Tel)  
(510) 291-3060 (Fax)

Attorneys for Defendant  
**ANTHONY LEVANDOWSKI**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN JOSE DIVISIONS**

1       The prosecution has filed a Notice of Related Case pursuant to Local Rule 8-1. *See*  
 2 *United States v. Levandowski*, N.D. Cal. No. CR 19-377 LHK, Dkt. 5; *see also Waymo LLC v.*  
 3 *Uber Tech., Inc. et al.*, N.D. Cal. No. CV 17-939 WHA (“*Waymo v. Uber*”), Dkt. 2704. In the  
 4 notice, the government explains its view that the above-captioned criminal matter is related to  
 5 *Waymo v. Uber* because “[b]oth actions concern one or more of the same alleged events,  
 6 occurrences, transactions, or property” and “there will be some duplication of labor if the [two  
 7 cases] are heard by different judges.” *Levandowski*, CR 19-377 LHK, Dkt. 5 at 2-3. The defense  
 8 concurs.

9           To be clear, Anthony Levandowski has pled not guilty in the criminal case and denies the  
 10 allegations contained in the government’s indictment. Nevertheless, without conceding the  
 11 *accuracy* of any of the contentions set forth in the government’s “Brief Statement of the  
 12 Relationship Between the Cases,” we accept the government’s *recital* of the allegations in the  
 13 criminal action and its description of the proceedings in *Waymo v. Uber*. *See id.* at 2. In  
 14 particular, we note the government’s recital that Mr. Levandowski “was not a party to the civil  
 15 action, but his alleged theft of Google files related to self-driving technology was central to  
 16 Waymo’s theory of the case,” and the government’s report concerning specific allegations that  
 17 arose in the earlier civil matter and now recur in the instant criminal case:

18           The Indictment identifies thirty-three specific files alleged to contain trade secrets.  
 19 The technology revealed in at least twelve of the files was the subject of litigation  
 20 in the civil case. For example, Counts One through Six of the Indictment relate to  
 21 Google’s transmit block configuration, trade secrets numbers two and seven in the  
 22 civil case. Count Twenty-Seven of the Indictment is a presentation regarding  
 23 Google’s unique fiber laser design and was trade secret number ninety in the civil  
 24 case.

25 *Id.*

26           In light of the relationship between certain allegations in the two cases, the overlap  
 27 between the technologies at issue in the two cases, and the extensive litigation relating to these  
 28 highly technical matters that Judge Alsup already oversaw in *Waymo v. Uber*, the defense

1 believes that the two “actions appear likely to entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by  
2 different Judges.” Local Rule 8-1(b)(2). Accordingly, “assignment to a single Judge is . . .  
3 likely to conserve judicial resources and promote an efficient determination” of the instant  
4 criminal case. Local Rule 8-1(c)(4).

5

6 Date: August 29, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

7

8

/s/

---

9 Miles Ehrlich  
10 Ismail Ramsey  
11 Amy Craig  
12 Ramsey & Ehrlich LLP  
13 803 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
Tel: (510) 548-3600  
Fax: (510) 291-3060

14

15

16

miles@ramsey-ehrlich.com  
izzy@ramsey-ehrlich.com  
amy@ramsey-ehrlich.com

17

*Counsel for Anthony Levandowski*

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28